IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GATX Technology	Corporation,	:
v.	Plaintiff,	: Civil Action No. 02-CV-03225
Commonwealth Ca Avon Products, Inc	_	: : :
	Defendant.	: :-
Commonwealth Ca	pital Corporation,	:
v.	Plaintiff,	: Civil Action No.01-CV-6915
Avon Products, Inc	••,	:
v.	Defendant and Third Party Plaintiff	: : :
El Camino Resourc and GATX Technol Corporation,		: : : :
	Third Party Defendants.	:
	<u>ORDER</u>	
AND NOW,	this day of	, 2002, upon consideration of
the Motion to Conso	lidate of GATX Technology	Services Corporation ("GATX"), and the
response thereto, it is	s hereby ORDERED that the	Motion to Consolidate is DENIED.
		United States District Judge
	T	e

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GATX Technology Corporation,

v.

Plaintiff, : Civil Action No. 02-CV-03225

Commonwealth Capital Corp and :

Avon Products, Inc.,

Defendant.

Commonwealth Capital Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v. : Civil Action No.01-CV-6915

Avon Products, Inc.,

Defendant and Third Party Plaintiff

V.

El Camino Resources, Ltd. and GATX Technology Services Corporation,

Third Party Defendants.

COMMONWEALTH CAPITAL CORPORATION'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO GATX'S MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

GATX Technology Corporation ("GATX") filed an interpleader Complaint alleging that it has been holding proceeds of \$ 396,837, plus interest, or \$411,784.53 in all, that it desires to return to one or more of the defendants. However, based upon the judicial admissions made in pleadings in this and a related action now pending before this Court made by plaintiff GATX and co-defendant Avon Products, Inc. ("Avon"), Commonwealth Capital Corporation ("Commonwealth") believes it is the sole entity with a claim on those funds. Accordingly, if

filed a motion for summary judgment in that Interpleader action brought by GATX.

Subsequently, GATX filed a motion to consolidate its interpleader action with the underlying collection action by Commonwealth. A hearing is scheduled on August 7, 2002 on all outstanding motions in the two related cases.

Commonwealth Capital contends that GATX's motion to consolidate should be denied because its own motion for summary judgment is pending and should be granted. However, if Commonwealth Capital's motion for summary judgment is denied, then Commonwealth Capital agrees that the two actions should be consolidated for discovery and disposition.

Respectfully submitted,

SPECTOR GADON & ROSEN, P.C.

July 24, 2002

Attorneys for Commonwealth Capital Corporation

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Bruce Bellingham, hereby certify that on the below date I served a true and correct copy of the attached Plaintiff Commonwealth Capital Corporation's Answer to Defendant Avon Products's Counter-claims upon the following counsel for defendant via First Class Mail:

W. Bourne Ruthrauff, Esq. Beth A. Carter, Esq. Bennett, Bricklin & Saltzburg, LLP 1601 Market St., 16th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19103

William Goldstein, Esq. Groen, Laveson, Goldberg & Rubenstone Four Greenwood Square, Ste. 200 Bensalem, PA 19020-8544

Noah H. Charlson, Esq. Bazelon, Less & Feldman, P.C. 1515 Market St., Ste. 700 Philadelphia, PA 19102-1907

By: _		
•	Bruce Bellingham	

Dated: July 24, 2002